

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

BLACK EMERGENCY RESPONSE TEAM et al.,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. CIV-21-1022-G
)	
GENTNER DRUMMOND, in his official capacity as Oklahoma Attorney General, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

Now before the Court is the State Defendants’ Motion for Clarification (Doc. No. 217). In this Motion, the State Defendants request that the Court “clarify the appropriate scope of discovery regarding Plaintiffs’ Fourteenth Amendment equal protection claim,” citing Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b)(2)(C). *Id.* at 1, 5. No response is needed for the Court to rule on the Motion.

Although Rule 26(b)(2)(C) permits a court to impose restrictions on discovery, the proper procedure for parties to obtain substantive, claim-specific rulings as to whether particular discovery will be allowed is outlined in Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26(c) and Rule 37(a) and elaborated upon in the associated Local Civil Rules. In short: after a request for specific discovery is made, an objection to that request is returned, and the parties through counsel meet and confer to attempt to resolve the dispute, then either the requesting party may file a motion to compel or the objecting party may seek a protective order. This procedure allows the court to address discovery disputes in a meaningful,

informed way. The State Defendants' Motion for Clarification asks this Court to supplant that procedure with one in which the Court would announce approved subjects and methods of discovery on the basis of arguments about relevance, privilege, and proportionality that have not even been briefed. The Motion (Doc. No. 217) is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 21st day of November, 2024.



CHARLES B. GOODWIN
United States District Judge